

**From:** Pauly, Brooks CIV USN BRAC PMO SAN CA (USA) [brooks.pauly@navy.mil]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 23, 2021 11:56 AM  
**To:** Bonura, Carl J CIV USN NAVFAC SW SAN CA (USA) [carl.bonura@navy.mil]  
**CC:** Ohannessian, Sharon A CIV USN NAVFAC SW SAN CA (USA) [sharon.ohannessian@navy.mil]; Robinson, Derek J CIV USN NAVFAC SW SAN CA (USA) [derek.j.robinson1@navy.mil]; Stoick, Paul T CIV USN NAVFAC SW SAN CA (USA) [paul.stoick@navy.mil]  
**Subject:** FW: Import Fill Acceptance Criteria

Hi Carl,

We have a question about the criteria that BRAC uses for import fill. For now we have an answer to current agency comments, but would like a stronger footing if they continue to push.

When, if ever, do we use the Waterboard's ESLs rather than the EPA's RSLs? I understand ESLs are guidance only and helpful for initial screening of COCs at sites, but our EPA PM is pushing these rather than the RSLs. I am guessing this has something to do with the Waterboard adopting the EPA's 0.03 attenuation factor for vapor intrusion. And in our case the EPA PM has consistently tried to push for more stringent levels even though we are an NPL site.

Am I correct in assuming that ESLs are still usually more conservative than RSLs? As I understand it, even RSLs might be overly conservative depending on a site's land use and whether RGs have been established.

Many thanks for any input you can provide.

v/r,  
Brooks

---

**From:** Ohannessian, Sharon A CIV USN NAVFAC SW SAN CA (USA) <sharon.ohannessian@navy.mil>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 23, 2021 8:26 AM  
**To:** Robinson, Derek J CIV USN NAVFAC SW SAN CA (USA) <derek.j.robinson1@navy.mil>; Pauly, Brooks CIV USN BRAC PMO SAN CA (USA) <brooks.pauly@navy.mil>  
**Subject:** Import Fill Acceptance Criteria

Hi Derek and Brooks,

I did a little more research regarding DTSC's request to use the HERO HHRA Note 3 screening levels for our import fill at Parcel C (Phase III RA). These soil screening levels are based on the California Toxicity Rule (22 CCR Section 69021), which the Navy has not made an ARAR determination on. So not only does the CA Toxicity Rule potentially affect our risk assessments, but it also potentially affects our import fill acceptance criteria.

I am going to respond to these comments that the Navy, to date, has not made an ARARs determination regarding Title 22 CCR Section 69021, and that we are going to follow the backfill acceptance criteria specified in the 2012 Final Design Basis Report and Appendix G (Backfill Acceptance Plan) of the 2015

Final Remedial Action Work Plan for the Installation of Durable Covers in Parcel C. Similar response (except for the ARAR determination of 22 CCR Section 69021) for Karen Ueno's request that we use the RWQCB environmental screening levels (ESLs) based on leaching to groundwater. We're going to use the criteria specified in our previously approved CERCLA documents and used for remedial action work already completed at Parcel C.

Lastly, in response to Karen's request to specify within the RAWP that a report of the evaluation of the proposed imported fill material be submitted to the BCT for evaluation prior to use of the imported fill at the site, I'm going to respond: "If proposed import fill does not indisputably meet all of the screening criteria specified in the SAP, the Navy will submit the data package to the BCT for concurrence prior to use."

Let me know what you think, but right now the above is what I'm going to tell the contractor to write up in the RTCs.

Sharon

Sharon Ohannessian  
Remedial Project Manager  
BRAC Program Management Office  
720 Kennon Street SE  
Building 36, Suite 320  
Washington Navy Yard, DC 20374  
(202) 685-1627  
sharon.ohannessian@navy.mil